

November 7, 2000

F:\ec\ec11010.dft
G:\sab\minutes\fy01min\ec11010.dft.wpd

With Comments from: Lippmann

**ACTION ITEMS AND INSTRUCTIONS STEMMING FROM
SAB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

NOVEMBER 1-2, 2000

[Full text of draft minutes is available on SAB Website: www.epa.gov/sab]

ACTIONS

ACTION 1: The Executive Committee approved *"Diffusion and Adoption of innovations in Environmental Protection—An SAB Workshop-Stimulated Commentary "*, subject to final edits discussed at the meeting

ACTION 2: The Executive Committee approved the Environmental Engineering Committee's *"Technology Performance: Appropriate Measures -- An SAB Commentary"*, subject to approval by the vettors (Drs. Seeker, Utell, and Anderson)

ACTION 3: The Executive Committee approved the Radiation Advisory Committee's *Technologically-enhanced Naturally Occurring radioactive Material (TENORM): Review of the USEPA's Proposed Approach to Evaluating Occurrence and Risks*", subject to final edits mentioned at the meeting.

ACTION 4: The Chair appointed a small group (Drs. Bull, Young, Anderson, Kasperson and Trussell) to work with Dr. Morgan in framing a Workshop-Stimulated Commentary that conveys an appropriate message to the Agency, on the basis of the series of workshops on New Approaches to Stakeholder Involvement. The group will conduct at least one publicly accessible conference call and present their work at the March, 2001 meeting of the Executive Committee.

INSTRUCTIONS

INSTRUCTION 1: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff Director to work with each Committee Chair for each Committee review to make a conscious decision about whether it would be appropriate/necessary/useful to take a transcript of the meeting.

INSTRUCTION 2: The EC instructed the Staff to teed up the following issue for discussion by the EC at a later time:

- a. How does/should the SAB identify the topics for its reports?
- b. How is/should the advice be generated and transmitted to the Agency?

c. How does/should the SAB develop and capture agreements within a Panel?

INSTRUCTION 3: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff to provide them with a list of the current EPA FACA Committees.

INSTRUCTION 4: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff to gather and distribute to the Executive Committee members information about the 21st Century (Data) Needs project.

INSTRUCTION 5: The Chair instructed the Staff to ensure that the new RSAC Chair, Dr. Ray Loehr, talks with key ORD and BOSC individuals (e.g., Drs. Noonan, Preuss, and Schnoor) soon.

INSTRUCTION 6: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff Director to follow up on the observations/suggestions that were made during the discussion of lessons learned from working with other FACA committees. Also, the Executive Committee members who will be participating in the Nov. 28 meeting should be alert to pursuing some of these issues.

INSTRUCTION 7: The Executive Committee instructed the Committees and the Staff to explicitly consider any possible environmental justice aspect associated with each of the projects the Committee might undertake.

INSTRUCTION 8: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff to arrange for a discussion with Mr. Charles Lee of Office of Environmental Justice (OEJ) at the March Executive Committee meeting regarding a possible SAB EJ project.

INSTRUCTION 9: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff to help all Members re-register for the Discussion DataBase (DDB) and to guide the SAB into using it. While the DDB holds the promise of improving the effectiveness of the Board, some Members more than others will need to be "eased into its use".

INSTRUCTION 10: The Executive Committee asked its Members to give suggestions to in order to Dr. Barnes regarding what information they would like to see posted on the Discussion DataBase (DDB).

INSTRUCTION 11: The Executive Committee instructed its Members to in order to work with SAB Staff to insure that the information in the People DatatBase (PDB) is accurate.

INSTRUCTION 12: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff Director to highlight for SAB Members and Consultants any project that might pose a specific party matter.

INSTRUCTION 13: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff Director to make certain that all appropriate waivers are in place to cover SAB Consultants.

INSTRUCTION 14: The Executive Committee asked the SAB Staff to work with the OGC to develop conflict-of-interest informational material that is more accessible by laymen and includes examples to illustrate the points.

INSTRUCTION 15: The Chair asked the Executive Committee members to examine the information about FY01 projects and be prepared to discuss it in detail at the Strategic Planning Retreat in March.

November, 3, 2000

F:\ec\ec11010.dft
G:\don\ec011010.dft

SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD
Executive Committee Meeting
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. Washington, DC
Ariel Rios Rm 6013
November, 1-2, 2000

I. Attendees

MEMBERS

| | |
|--|------------|
| Dr. Henry Anderson | |
| Dr. Richard Bull | |
| Dr. Hilary Inyang | |
| Dr. Janet Johnson | |
| Dr. Roger Kasperperson | |
| Dr. Joseph Mauderly (Acting Interim Chair) | |
| Dr. M. Granger Morgan | 11/1 |
| Dr. Wm. Randall Seeker | |
| Dr. William Smith | |
| Dr. Mark Utell | |
| Dr. Terry Young | 11/1 in AM |

DFO

Dr. Donald Barnes, Designated Federal Officer

Others present at the meeting are listed on the sign-in sheets (Attachment A).

II. Agenda (Attachment B)

[The items are generally presented in these minutes in their most logical, not necessarily their most chronological, order.]

III. Introduction

A. Chair's Introduction

Dr. Mauderly had agreed to serve as Acting Interim Chair at the request of Dr. Morton Lippmann the Interim Chair, who was otherwise engaged in conducting the meeting of the SAB Subcommittee on Dioxin Reassessment on November 1-2. He referred the members to the minutes of the most recent meeting, the teleconference call on September 22, 2000 (Attachment C).

B. Staff Director's Updates

1. Membership

Dr. Barnes distributed a list of the membership decisions for FY01 that had been made by the Administrator (Attachment D).

2. Personnel

a. SAB Staffing

1) Ms. Pozun/Ms. Tillery-Gadson

He announced that Ms. Diana Pozun had assumed the role of Management Assistant for the EC and Lead Secretary for the OSAB. She will fill the position previously held by Ms. Priscilla Tillery-Gadson who has moved a position of greater responsibility in OSAB. Ms. Tillery-Gadson expressed her appreciation for her time in dealing with the Members. The EC expressed their warm appreciation for her efforts over the years.

2) Dr. Jack Kooyoomjian

Dr. Barnes announced that Dr. Kooyoomjian had rejoined the staff after completing an 8-month stint in the Office of Co-Operative Environmental Management.

b. Dr. Dorothy Patton

Dr. Barnes announced that Dr. Dorothy Patton, Director of the Office of Science Policy in ORD, had retired in late July. Dr. Patton had been a frequent and honored visitor to the EC.

3. Status of Actions and Instructions from earlier meetings.

Dr. Barnes distributed a summary of the status of Actions and Instructions from the July, 2000 meeting Research Triangle Park, NC and the September teleconference call (Attachment E)

4. SAB Testimony before the Senate EPWC

The members received copies of the testimony of Drs. Lippmann and Hopke, as well as their answers to followup questions, resulting from their appearance at a hearing on comparative and residual risks before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee (Attachment F). Both witnesses had noted cautions regarding the charges issued by Congress and the Agency's methods to respond to those charges, in the context of comparative risk.

5. *"Toward Integrated Environmental Decision-making"*

Copies of the recently released *"Toward Integrated Environmental Decision-making"* were distributed to the members (Attachment G). This report is the result of the longest, most complex, and more interdisciplinary effort in the history of the Board. Followup activities within the Agency and within the SAB are currently underway.

5. *"SAB Matters"*

Dr. Barnes referred to the first issue of *"SAB Matters"* (Attachment H), describing it as a newsletter for SAB Members and Consultants that addresses important administrative issues that need to be of interest to the target group.

IV. Reports from Committee [See Committee Summaries (Attachment I)]

A. Council on Clean Air Analysis Compliance (Council)

In the absence of the Council Chair, Dr. Cropper, Dr. Nugent (Council Designated Federal Officer (DFO)) updated the EC on the recent activities of the Committee.

B. Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC)

Dr. Mauderly, in his capacity as CASAC Chair, updated the EC on the recent activities of the Committee. In particular, he reviewed the recent CASAC meeting on diesel emissions, at which the CASAC "closed" (i.e., approved) the Agency's document. He noted that the absence of a transcript of the meeting will make completion of the minutes and the report more difficult. There was general discussion about the circumstances that would require warrant a transcript being taken. Some members felt that the transcript can be useful in capturing consensus and nuances, although getting the transcript can be rather expensive; e.g, \$2000/day. It appears that there is no single solution to guide that decision in all cases.

INSTRUCTION 1: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff Director to work with each Committee Chair for each Committee review to make a conscious decision about whether it would be appropriate/necessary/useful to take a transcript of the meeting.

Further discussion revealed that Committees (e.g., CASAC) operate so that no new information is introduced following the public meeting. The focus of CASAC meeting are often deceptively simple "Go/No Go" decisions. In that case, the public meeting is a snapshot whose latent image is simply "developed" in the report. In other Committees, the questions are often much broader and require more analysis and rationale. The public meeting of the Committee in these cases is the initiation of a process which culminates in another public review meeting; i.e., the Executive Committee. During the interim the Committee can work through several drafts as it seeks consensus on the exact language of the report.

INSTRUCTION 2: The EC instructed the Staff to teed up the following issue for discussion by the EC at a later time:

- a. How does/should the SAB identify the topics for its reports?
- b. How is/should the advice be generated and transmitted to the Agency?
- c. How does/should the SAB develop and capture agreements within a Panel?

C. Drinking Water Committee (DWC)

Dr. Bull updated the EC on the recent activities of the Committee, paying particular attention to recent work on the Candidate Contaminant List (CCL) and the arsenic in drinking water regulation.

D. Ecological Process and Effects Committee(EPEC)

Dr. Young updated the EC on the recent activities of the Committee, highlighting, in particular, their work on the Environmental Report Card. The Committee has generated a template for an "ideal" Report Card that should be helpful in evaluating specific suggestions for report cards that have been developed by others.

E. Environmental Economics Advisory Committee (EEAC)

Mr. Tom Miller updated the EC on the recent activities of the Committee.

F. Environmental Engineering Committee (EEC)

The Chair, Dr. Hilary Inyang, updated the EC on the recent activities of the Committee, in particular the work on the Relative Risk Reductions Options Subcommittee (RROS) and the review of the Natural Attenuation Research Program.

1) *"Diffusion and Adoption of innovations in Environmental Protection—An SAB Workshop-Stimulated Commentary"* (Attachment J)

Drs. Inyang, Kasperson, and Nugent provided background information about how the workshop came about and the resulting decision by the EEC to generate written advice to the Agency.

Dr. Morgan, Lead Discussant, provided handwritten comments (Attachment K). While he had some suggestions for improvements in the report, he said that he would support its approval. Dr. Mauderly, Associate Discussant, likewise provided comments (Attachment L), while indicating that he saw no show-stoppers. Dr. Greer, the other Associate Discussant, was unable to attend the meeting.

Dr. Johnson commented on the use of examples in the report from the Workshop, *per se*. She felt that including some such aspects in the Commentary would help to crystallize its message.

ACTION 1: The Executive Committee approved *"Diffusion and Adoption of innovations in Environmental Protection—An SAB Workshop-Stimulated Commentary"*, subject to final edits discussed at the meeting

2) *"Technology Performance: Appropriate Measures --An SAB Commentary"* (Attachment M)

Dr. Edgar Berkey, Chair of the Technology Performance Subcommittee, joined the meeting by phone and provided background information on the activity. Dr. Inyang noted that this Commentary was an updating of work originally submitted to the EC two years ago.

Dr. Seeker, the Lead Discussant, encouraged the group to expand its work somewhat and to clarify some of its points. Dr. Utell, an Associate Discussant, found the work to be a bit abstract. The use of the SITE program as an example was helpful. Reference to additional examples would be even more helpful, particularly in the transmittal letter. Dr. Anderson, the other Associate Discussant, encouraged a more explicit statement of the recommendations of the work, something that would challenge the Agency to follow through with a meaningful response.

ACTION 2: The Executive Committee approved the Environmental Engineering Committee's *"Technology Performance: Appropriate Measures -- An SAB Commentary"*, subject to approval by the vetters (Drs. Seeker, Utell, and Anderson)

G. Environmental Health Committee (EHC)

Dr. Mark Utell, the EHC Chair, updated the EC on the recent activities of the Committee, emphasizing the review the EHC of the Agency's report to Congress on IRIS. Dr. Morgan agreed that the mechanism used in this effort -- that is, a Consultation with the EC, followed by a review by one of its Committees -- was an example effective interaction with the Agency "at arms length". However, care must be taken that the Consultation not be taken as being directive.

H. Integrated Human Exposure Committee (IHEC)

Dr. Anderson, the IHEC Chair, updated the EC on the recent activities of the Committee.

I. Radiation Advisory Committee (RAC)

Dr. Johnson, the RAC Chair, updated the EC on the recent activities of the Committee.

Dr. Gesell joined the meeting by phone and introduced the EC's review of *"Technologically-enhanced Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material (TENORM): Review of the USEPA's Proposed Approach to Evaluating Occurrence and Risks -- An SAB Advisory"* (Attachment N). Dr. Bull, the Lead Discussant, submitted written comments (Attachment O). Dr. Inyang, an Associate Discussant, had mailed his comments to the EC members (Attachment P). Dr. Smith, the other Associate Discussant, had faxed in his comments (Attachment Q). Dr. Kasperson could some of the answers to the Charge questions to be unclear. He urged that the writers of the report use more explicit language in stating their answers.

ACTION 3: The Executive Committee approved the Radiation Advisory Committee's *Technologically-enhanced Naturally Occurring radioactive Material (TENORM): Review of the USEPA's Proposed Approach to Evaluating Occurrence and Risks"*, subject to final edits mentioned at the meeting.

J. Research Strategies Advisory Committee (RSAC)

Dr. Seeker, the RSAC Chair, updated the EC on the recent activities of the Committee. He noted particularly the successful Consultation that the RSAC had had recently regarding the ORD Strategic Plan. Dr. Noonan, AA/ORD, found the exercise to be very valuable.

Dr. Morgan called the EC's attention to the provocative book by Donald Strokes, entitled Pasteur's Quadrant.

K. Special Subcommittees

1) Dioxin Reassessment

Dr. Barnes reminded the EC that Dr. Lippmann was conducting the review at the same time as the EC meeting. Initial reports are that the review meeting is going well.

2) National Air Toxics Assessment (NATA) Subcommittee

Ms. Melanie Medina-Metzger, DFO for the Subcommittee, joined the meeting by phone and provided some background information on the project. The SAB review is slated for January.

V. SAB Workshop on New Approaches to Stakeholder Involvement

Dr. Morgan led the EC through the fourth workshop in this series. A summary of the meeting is attached (Attachment R).

ACTION 4: The Chair appointed a small group (Drs. Bull, Young, Anderson, Kasperson and Trussell) to work with Dr. Morgan in framing a Workshop-Stimulated Commentary that conveys an appropriate message to the Agency, on the basis of the series of workshops on New Approaches to Stakeholder Involvement. The group will conduct at least one publicly accessible conference call and present their work at the March, 2001 meeting of the Executive Committee.

VI. Reports on Activities of Other FACA Committees

A. Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC)

Dr. Jerald Schnoor of the University of Iowa, Chair of the BOSC, joined the meeting by phone. He updated the EC on recent and planned activities of the BOSC (Attachment S). The Council will focus on helping the Agency Labs and Centers in three areas: review their strategic plans, their internal and external communications activities, and their workforce practices. In addition, they plan to examine some of the multi-year plans in specific research areas, an activity in which they would look forward to working jointly with the SAB. In a separate matter, the BOSC has recommended Dr. Marilyn Brown as a candidate to serve on an NRC Panel that is being formed to look at ORD's Science to Achieve Results (STAR) grants program.

A number of EC members responded positively to working with BOSC on some matter(s), especially the review of the multi-year research plans.

B. Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP)

Dr. Barnes introduced the discussion by presenting Mr. Larry Dorsey, SAP DFO, with an award for the work that he did as co-DFO (along with Mr. Sam Rondberg) for the Data from the Testing of Human Subjects Subcommittee.

Dr. Ron Kendall, SAP Chair, joined the meeting by phone. He commented on the increased pace of SAP activities. The group now meets about every 6-8 weeks, covering a wide array of issues. In order to accomplish this work, the SAP members divide leadership responsibilities for various issues and involve some of the 250 Consultants currently available to them. Dr. Kendall mentioned the cooperative efforts between SAB and SAP and looks forward to further interactions in the future.

C. Meeting of FACA Chairs

Mr. Clarence Hardy, Director of the Office of Cooperative Environmental Management (OCEM), provided background information about that office (Attachment T) and introduced Mr. Tim Sherer, Director of Committee Management at the Agency, who described the meeting of FACA Chairs, scheduled for Nov. 28. The goal is to explore ways to use the FACA resources of the Agency (i.e., >1400 advisors and >\$5M in funding) more effectively and more strategically. This goal will be accomplished by getting the Chairs to meet one another and to seek areas of commonality between FACA Committee efforts; e.g., providing advice on related issues and confronting similar operational problems. The facilitated meeting will be followed up with a focus group discussion of some Chairs in January.

INSTRUCTION 3: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff to provide them with a list of the current EPA FACA Committees.

D. Children's Health Protection Advisory Committee (CHPAC)

Dr. Michael Firestone, Science Director in the Office of Children's Health Protection (OCHP), conveyed the regrets to Dr. Joel Bender, Chair of the Science & Technology Working (S&TWG) Group of CHPAC, who was unable to be with the EC. Dr. Bender's and the CHPAC's main concern is that the Agency fully and explicitly consider the issue of "lifestage susceptibility" when addressing various issues. He seeks SAB cooperation in this matter.

The S&TWG operates to inform its members about Agency activities and child-related issues. For example, the S&TWG has examined ORD Children's Strategy for research. They are exploring hosting a Workshop on Human Testing, with a special emphasis on children. They have asked questions about Cancer Risk Assessment Guidelines. They are concerned about the limited attention paid to lifestage susceptibility in the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS). In conducting its business, the CHPAC both responds to Agency requests and pursues self-initiated activities.

In order to provide a concrete mechanism for CHPAC concerns to be raised, Dr. Firestone recommended that the SAB work with OCHP when negotiating its Charge for a particular review. Dr. Bull remarked that the work of the DWC rarely considers these issues explicitly and should probably do so. Dr. Kasperson observed that many of these issues have perception and social sciences aspects to them and that activities, such as the Agency-sponsored NRC project on Cumulative Risk, should involve social scientists. Dr. Anderson identified at least three areas as CHPAC "priority projects":

1. The 21st Century (Data) Needs project
2. Ethical issues associated with lifestage susceptibility
3. Cancer Guidelines improvements

He recommended SAB involvement in each.

INSTRUCTION 4: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff to gather and distribute to the EC members information about the 21st Century (Data) Needs project.

VII. Meeting with Agency Officials

A. Dr. Norine Noonan, Assistant Administrator, Office of Research & Development

Dr. Noonan updated the EC on a variety of ORD-related issues. She reported that the Agency had done reasonably well in the FY01 appropriation process. In the science area, there trend of increasing number of "earmarks" was stemmed, if not reversed. In addition, Congress appropriated new funds to pay for many, but not all, of the earmarks. There were no "general reductions" (aimed at the Agency overall) and no specific reductions aimed specifically at ORD.

She updated the EC on the plans to move into the new building Research Triangle Park, the structure that so impressed the EC at their July meeting.

The ORD Strategic Plan has been updated and identifies five goals:

1. Support the mission of the Agency
2. Be high-performance organization
3. Be and be seen as leaders in environmental science and technology
4. Become more integrating in several aspects
5. Become an organization that anticipates future problems before they occur.

Both BOSC and RSAC have provided helpful input on the Strategic Plan. Both organizations will be looked to in order to in order to in order to help in the implementation of the Plan.

INSTRUCTION 5: The Chair instructed the Staff to ensure that the new RSAC Chair, Dr. Ray Loehr, talks with key ORD and BOSC individuals (e.g., Drs. Noonan, Preuss, and Schnoor) soon.

There is still a significant problem in synthesizing the results of ORD -related research in such a way that it is useful to ORD customers; e.g., the program offices.

The ORD relationship with the Regions has changed. In place of the ORD Regional Scientist Program (in which ORD personnel would rotate to the Regions for 1-2 years), ORD has transferred FTEs and dollars to each of the Regions in order to permit hiring of science advisors. In addition, ORD is funding three workshops each year for these new Regional technical talents.

Dr. Noonan and the EC agreed that it is becoming increasingly important that the Office of Environmental Information (OEI) become effective gatherers, interpreters, and distributors of environmental data.

There are a number of issues/areas in which ORD is not well-staffed to address; e.g., bioinformatics.

VIII. Board Business and Concerns

A. Lessons learned from SAB interaction with other FACAs

Dr. Seeker, experienced in a joint SAB/ BOSC activity, reminded the EC that his experience with RSAC and BOSC revealed that not all FACA committees have the same procedures and meshing their operations can be difficult. He recommended that we carefully walk through all

aspects of a joint activity are reach agreement on how each step will be addressed. Issues include the following:

1. Off-line meetings
2. Report approval process
3. Whether there will be a single joint report or two separate reports
4. The recipient(s) of the report(s)
5. The elements of the Charge
6. A mutually agreed upon "process map"

Dr. Utell, experienced a joint SAB/SAP activity, noted that problems are more likely when the topic of the joint activity is one about wide there is a wide range of opinion. It is important that the co-Chair meet early to discuss process issues. The two DFOs must work closely together and have their sole allegiance to the joint project, not to one of the participating FACAs or the other. In like fashion, there needs to be agreement at the office director level (e.g., Dr. Barnes) and an operational commitment to "make it work". Transcripts can be particularly valuable in such meetings, so that there will be common source of information about what actually happened at a meeting. It is more important than usual to have agreement about the Charge. Despite all preparations, we need to realize that "cultural differences" will exist between different FACAs (at least until there is more experience in working on join projects) and that can be a source of surprise, if not friction. Therefore, all parties need to remain flexible and committed to making the joint activity work.

Dr. Seeker also noted that all FACAs do not have a common underlying mission. For example, the SAB often functions as an independent, objective peer reviewer Agency work. Some other FACAs have the mission of providing input to in order to the Agency about certain interested and affected parties. Cooperative work between groups with fundamentally different missions needs to in order to be carefully considered and even more carefully conducted.

Dr. Bull, who has participated in DWC, National Drinking Water Advisory Committee (NDWAC), and the Disinfectants/Disinfection By-Products (D/DBP) FACA, remarked that it takes time to understand and appreciate the differences between FACAs, even those that are operating in closely related areas.

Dr. Mauderly noted that it would be smart for the Agency to make "strategic" FACA membership appointments, so that there would be an overlap/linkage/liaison in Members of related FACAs.

In a related comment, Dr. Utell remarked that the different FACAs could be helpful in contributing to the Charges that guide each other's activities.

INSTRUCTION 6: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff Director to follow up on the observations/suggestions that were made during the discussion of lessons learned from working with other FACA committees. Also, the EC members who will be participating in the Nov. 28 meeting should be alert to pursuing some of these issues.

B. Proposed SAB Environmental Justice Project

Dr. Inyang reported on his conversations with the Office of Environmental Justice (OEJ) and a possible project related to in order to EJ (Attachment U), stemming from the meeting of the National Environmental Justice Advisory Committee (NEJAC) meeting that he and Dr. Anderson had attended in Atlanta last May and had reported on at the July EC meeting. Since that time, he has been in conversations with Mr. Charles Lee of OEJ to explore various possibilities. The intent would be to keep the SAB focused on the underlying scientific issues of the problem. The EC should now await a proposal from the OEJ before deciding what, if anything, more should be done.

Dr. Bull noted that some of appropriation bills working their way through Congress emphasize upgrading the nation's infrastructure. There should be clear EJ issues associated with such activity.

Dr. Mauderly noted that there are at least two questions associated with EJ issues that would fall within the preview of the SAB:

1. What, if any, is the scientific basis for EJ concerns in a given area?
2. What are the information or interpretive gaps that keep the Agency from meeting its mandate vis avis these issues?

In his view, only after the EC has answered -- or seen the Agency's answers to -- these questions can the SAB evaluate whether or not to undertake a project.

The EC generally agreed that a major scientific problem in EJ matters lay in establishing a cause-and-effect linkage between EJ measures and deleterious effects to human health and the environment.

INSTRUCTION 7: The Executive Committee instructed the Committees and the Staff to explicitly consider any possible environmental justice aspect associated with each of the projects the Committee might undertake.

INSTRUCTION 8: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff to in order to arrange for a discussion with Mr. Charles Lee of OEJ at the March EC meeting regarding a possible SAB EJ project.

C. Computer Developments

Dr. Angela Nugent updated the EC on the status of two aspects of the Board's computer systems.

1) The Discussion Data Base (DDB)

The disruption caused by security problems in the Agency's computer system has been resolved. Therefore, all members are encouraged to re-register for the DDB, as some already have.

INSTRUCTION 9: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff to help all Members re-register for the DDB and to guide the SAB into using it. While the DDB holds the promise of improving the effectiveness of the Board, some Members more than others will need to be "eased into its use".

In addition to in order to be a firewall-protected forum for SAB discussion, the DDB is also a repository for information that is useful to SAB Members; e.g., blank Confidential Financial Information forms, back issues of *SAB Matters*, etc.

INSTRUCTION 10: The Executive Committee asked its Members to give suggestions to Dr. Barnes regarding what information they would like to see posted on the Discussion DataBase DDB .

2) The People Data Base (PDB)

The PDB has been developed by OSAB to improve the accuracy and facility of handling information about SAB Members, Consultants, Staff, Nominees, etc.

INSTRUCTION 11: The Executive Committee instructed its Members to work with SAB Staff to insure that the information in the People DataBase (PDB) is accurate.

D. Training on conflict-of-interest

Mr. Hale Hawbecker of the Office of General Counsel discussed issues related to conflicts-of-interest that may affect special government employees (SGEs), like SAB Members and Consultants. He worked through highlights of Ethics Advisory 97-15 (Attachment V). The Confidential Financial Interest form (Form 450) helps identify potential conflicts-of-interest as it relates to financial holdings. The Science Advisory Board generally does not get involved in "particular party matters"; e.g., review of a particular grant or contract. the Board focuses on "matters of general applicability"; e.g., guidelines or rule-making.

INSTRUCTION 12: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff Director to highlight for SAB Members and Consultants any project that might pose a specific party matter.

The office of Government Ethics has exempted FACA Members from the prohibition of addressing issues that might affect the financial interest of their employer. In the case of Consultants, the SGE can be granted a waiver on the basis of the fact that the benefit of that person's advice outweighs the conflict.

INSTRUCTION 13: The Executive Committee instructed the Staff Director to make certain that all appropriate waivers are in place to cover SAB Consultants.

Mr. Hawbecker alluded to the distinction between "diversified mutual funds" and "sector funds", a topic about which the Office of Government Ethics has written extensively.

INSTRUCTION 14: The Executive Committee asked the SAB Staff to work with the OGC to develop conflict-of-interest informational material that is more accessible by laymen and includes examples to illustrate the points.

E. SAB Projects for FY01

Dr. Jack Fowle, Deputy SAB Staff Director, presented information and analytical information about projects that the SAB has been requested by Agency offices to undertake in FY01.

INSTRUCTION 15: The Chair asked the Executive Committee members to examine the information about FY01 projects and be prepared to discuss it in detail at the Strategic Planning Retreat in March.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned on Thursday, November 2 at 3:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Concurred,

Donald G. Barnes, Ph.D.
Designated Federal Official

Joe Mauderly, D.V.M.
Acting Interim Chair, EC

ATTACHMENTS TO IN ORDER TO THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD

November 1-2

- Attachment A -- Sign-in sheets
- Attachment B -- Agenda
- Attachment C -- Minutes from the Sept. 22, 2000 conference call
- Attachment D -- Administrator's Membership decisions for FY01
- Attachment E -- Status of Actions and Instructions from July 13, 2000 and Sept. 22, 2000 meetings.
- Attachment F -- Testimonies of Dr. Lippmann and Hopke before the Senate Committee on
Environment and Public Works; and Responses to Followup Questions.
- Attachment G -- *"Toward Integrated Environmental Decision-making"*
- Attachment H -- First issue of *"SAB Matters"*
- Attachment I -- Committee Summaries
- Attachment J -- EEC Draft of *"Diffusion and Adoption of innovations in Environmental
Protection--An SAB Workshop-Stimulated Commentary"*
- Attachment K -- Dr. Morgan's comments on *"Diffusion and Adoption of innovations in
Environmental Protection--An SAB Workshop-Stimulated Commentary"*
- Attachment L -- Dr. Mauderly's comments on *"Diffusion and Adoption of innovations in
Environmental Protection--An SAB Workshop-Stimulated Commentary"*
- Attachment M -- *"Technology Performance: Appropriate Measures --An SAB Commentary"*
- Attachment N -- *"Technologically-enhanced Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material
(TENORM): Review of the USEPA's Proposed Approach to Evaluating Occurrence and Risks -- An SAB Advisory"*
- Attachment O -- Dr. Bull's comments on *"Technologically-enhanced Naturally Occurring
Radioactive Material (TENORM): Review of the USEPA's
Proposed Approach to Evaluating Occurrence and Risks -- An
SAB Advisory"*
- Attachment P -- Dr. Smith's comments on *"Technologically-enhanced Naturally Occurring
Radioactive Material (TENORM): Review of the USEPA's
Proposed Approach to Evaluating Occurrence and Risks -- An
SAB Advisory"*
- Attachment Q -- Dr. Kasperson's comments on *"Technologically-enhanced Naturally Occurring
Radioactive Material (TENORM): Review of the USEPA's
Proposed Approach to Evaluating Occurrence and Risks -- An
SAB Advisory"*
- Attachment R -- Summary of the Workshop on New Approaches to Stakeholder Involvement
- Attachment S -- Summary of BOSC Activities/Plans
- Attachment T -- Summary of OCEM and plans for meeting of FACA Chairs on Nov. 28
- Attachment U -- Dr. Inyang's information about a possible project on environmental justice
- Attachment V -- Ethics Advisory 97-15

ATTACHMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE WORKSHOP

Attachment WA --

Attachment WB --

Attachment WC --

Attachment WD --